

**ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE
ON
HUMAN SERVICES
Assembly Member Jim Beall, Jr., Chair
Informational Hearing
Friday, November 16, 2007
1:30 - 5:00 p.m.
City of Campbell – Community Center
1 W. Campbell Avenue, Roosevelt Room
Campbell, CA 95008**

**Testimony
Dale L. Dutton, Parent & Consultant
D3 Associates
Larkspur, CA**

***Taking the Lanterman Act into the Future:
The SB 1270 Report Recommendations – Expanding Opportunities and Choice
for Individuals with Developmental Disabilities***

3:00 – 3:45 – Setting a Course for Fully Integrated Community Employment

National Employment Research, Resources, Data and Trends

Introduction and Background

Thank you, Assembly Member Beall and Committee. I am honored to be invited to speak this afternoon. I am a parent of a young adult consumer in the California System of Developmental Disability Services.

I became a “professional” in this field in 1985, with the introduction of Supported Employment in California. As an interested parent and businessman from the community, I joined the Supported Employment implementation and technical assistance staff at the University of San Francisco. We participated in the interagency work of system change provided by a grant from the federal Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services – through our Department of Rehabilitation, from 1985 - 1990. From that introduction to the service side of our field, I later managed two provider agencies in California – one very large and one very small – each committed to quality employment outcomes for our consumers. From 1995 – 2005, I worked for the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) in national marketing, training and quality standards development for the developmental disabilities field. CARF currently accredits over 10,000 Community Rehabilitation Providers (CRPs) nationally and is required for provider certification in California. I retired in 2005, and have spent the last few years working as a consultant at both the national and state level to continue to support providers in their efforts to enhance the lives of persons with developmental disabilities. I currently serve as the President of the governing board of a small provider agency in Marin County. We serve

approximately 50 individuals in very individualized community based residential, day and employment settings. Together with several other colleagues, I am currently championing state-wide efforts to expand self-employment and consumer owned business opportunities for our population. I was pleased to be asked to join the SB 1270 Workgroup – alongside a number of individuals here today and in the prior hearing.

A National Perspective

This afternoon, I want to bring the Committee some of the current thinking and research being done on employment opportunities for persons with developmental disabilities at the national level. I hope this “environmental scan” can provide a context for your consideration of the recommendations from the SB 1270 report and the other testimonies you have received in these meetings. This “information” is not mine – but the work of several well respected research organizations and professionally recognized individuals whom I have had the pleasure to know over the years. We have provided sources and documentation of this presentation for the committee’s use in greater examination.

First, we’d like to review the results of a study entitled “Integrated Employment or Sheltered Workshops: Preferences of Adults with Intellectual Disabilities, their Families, and Staff”. It was published in the Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, Volume 26, Number 1, 2007. (The article is copyrighted by ISO Press, but I have purchased a copy and will be pleased to contribute it to the Committee for further study.)

The researchers (Alberto Migiliore, David Mank, Teresa Grossi, and Patricia Rogan) asked two basic questions of 210 individuals then receiving employment services in 19 Sheltered Workshops scattered across the US. Each respondent, their family and staff were queried on:

1. Would you prefer employment outside the workshop?
2. Do you think you have the ability to work outside the workshop?

You’ll see some interesting messages in the responses:

1. 74% of the persons with disability said “Yes” or “Maybe”
2. 67% of their families said “Yes” or “Maybe”
3. 65% of their staff said “Yes” or “Maybe”

The “Maybe” became clear with answers to the second question:

1. 82% of the persons with disability said “Yes” or “Yes, with support”
2. 75% of their families said “Yes”, or “Yes, with support”
3. 78% of their staff said “Yes”, or “Yes, with Support”

Thus we see the sentiment and the “demand” for integrated services.

As a comparison on the “supply” side, we will next show the data from ICI (the Institute for Community Inclusion, Univ. of Mass. at Boston) Data Note 11b, 9/2007, included in your resource materials, showing service placements from 1999 through 2004, indicating:

1. A slight drop in segregated sheltered workshop service settings;
2. An increase in community non-work activities; and

3. A decrease in community integrated work.

The researcher's considered explanation – "System funding favors facility-based services."

Next, we'd like to review several slides of wage data from ICI. Nothing really new here, but reputable, established information that confirms:

1. People with disabilities are 3 times more likely to be in poverty than those without disability;
2. The employment rate for adults with disability is 1/3 of that for those without disability;
3. The weekly wages for adults with disability are 1/3 of that for those without disability;
4. The persons with ID working in sheltered employment make less than 1/3 of those in integrated community employment;
5. That the majority of even those in integrated community employment work less than 1/2 time (20 hours per week or less), and finally,
6. A pie chart showing the relative mix of services ICI found in 2003.

In closing, 5 slides will preview and introduce our next two speakers on this panel. First, a national look, state-by state, at the percentage of the total MR/DD/ID population served in integrated employment in 2004, with details for California and Washington. We have a way to go, and can learn from the success of our colleagues to the north.

The State Employment Leadership Network is a recent resource announced by ICI and The National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services (NASDDDS) to assist in state policy direction efforts. The Network includes both California and Washington in its initial coverage and is being hosted by our Department of Developmental Disabilities Services – and is very new to many of us. Perhaps Julia Mullen or Ray Jensen can tell us more about their plans?

Lastly, two slides that tell us what the lack of employment for this population is costing just one federal agency, the Social Security Administration, per year (\$100 Billion!), and the grossly underutilized work incentives available from SSA if we just had a system resource of benefits analysis, planning and management in place for our population.

Thank you again for your time and interest this afternoon. I'll be glad to try and answer any questions you may have about this information or its sources.